

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

BENNITA CRAWFORD,

Plaintiff,

v.

AEROTEK, INC.,

Defendant.

---

Case No. 09-cv-12932

HONORABLE STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**  
(docket no. 40) **AND GRANTING AEROTEK'S**  
**MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT** (docket no. 33)

Bennita Crawford filed this employment discrimination action pro se on July 24, 2009. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge for all pretrial proceedings. Crawford subsequently retained counsel. Aerotek moved for summary judgment on April 13, 2011. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") on February 17, 2012, after taking the motions under consideration. He suggests that the Court grant Aerotek's motion. Crawford asked for additional time to object to the Report, and the Court granted an extension until March 12, 2012. Nonetheless, Crawford still failed to file objections prior to the extended cutoff date.

Civil Rule 72(b) governs review of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation. De novo review of the magistrate judge's findings is only required if the parties "serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). Nevertheless, because a district judge always retains jurisdiction over a motion after referring it to a magistrate judge, he is entitled to review the magistrate judge's findings of fact and conclusions of law on his own initiative. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 154 (1985) (clarifying that while a district court judge need not review a report and

recommendation “de novo if no objections are filed, it does not preclude further review by the district judge, sua sponte or at the request of a party, under a de novo or any other standard”).

Because Crawford did not file objections, de novo review of the Report's conclusions is not required. Having reviewed the Report's analysis, in light of the record, the Court finds that its conclusions are factually based and legally sound. Accordingly, it will adopt the Report's findings, grant the motion for summary judgment, and dismiss this case.

**WHEREFORE**, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report (docket no. 40) is **ADOPTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Aerotek's motion for summary judgment (docket no. 33) is **GRANTED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

s/Stephen J. Murphy, III  
STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III  
United States District Judge

Dated: March 20, 2012

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on March 20, 2012, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

Carol Cohron  
Case Manager